Appl. No. 10/665,809
Amdt. dated December 7, 2007
Reply to Office Action of June 21, 2007

PATENT

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-16 are pending in the present application and stand rejected.

Claims 1-3, 5-8, 11-12, and 15-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Smith (US Patent No. 5,561,768).

Claims 4, 9-10, and 13-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Smith in view of Van Doren (US Patent Publication No. 2001/0037435).

Claims 1, 6, and 12-14, and 16 are amended. Claim 5 is cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. New claim 17 is added. Support for the new and amended claims can be found throughout the application. Among other places, support can be found beginning at page 3 and with reference to Figs 1-2. No new matter has been added.

Objections to the Specification

Paragraphs [0018] and [0023] are amended to address informalities identified by the Examiner. It is believed that appropriate corrections have been made. Accordingly, withdrawal of the objections is respectfully requested.

Rejections under Section 102

1. Claim 1

Claim 1 recites a telecommunications device for processing packet data received over a communications network. The device includes, in part, "a plurality of control processors, each control processor configured to manage data routing paths for routing the packet data through data processors in the plurality of data processors to destinations on the network; and a plurality of logical nodes...wherein each logical node is associated with a distinct network service provider and routes data for the network service provider... to its destination on the network." Applicants respectfully submit that Smith does not disclose a telecommunications device with these features.

Smith discusses a parallel processing computer system which includes control processors and processing nodes. The control processors send commands to the processing nodes. In response, the processing nodes perform selected types of arithmetic operations. See, Smith at col. 2, line 58 - col. 3, line 6. According to Smith, processing tasks may be partitioned so that different processing nodes can work on the same task concurrently, or so that different applications can be executed in parallel. See, Smith at col. 3, lines 51 - 55.

Applicants respectfully submit that Smith's parallel processing computer system is not a telecommunications device and it does not route packet data to destinations on a communications network. Thus, Smith does not disclose control processors that "manage data routing paths for routing the packet data through data processors in the plurality of data processors to destinations on the network."

In addition, Smith fails to disclose that data processors are arranged to form logical nodes which, in turn, are associated with different network service providers and carry data traffic for the different service providers. Thus, Smith does not teach "each logical node is associated with a distinct network service provider and routes data for the network service provider using the one or more data processors included in the logical node according to the data routing paths for routing packet data to its destination on the network" as recited above.

2.   Claims 6, 12

Claims 6 and 12 each recite features similar to those discussed in connection with claim 1 and each is believed allowable over Smith for at least the reasons previously given. For example, claim 6 recites a "telecommunications shelf for sending packet data to destinations on a communications network" in which logical shelves are associated with, and transfer data for, different network service providers. Smith does not disclose a telecommunication shelf with these features.

Claim 12 recites a method for routing packet data over a communication network including, in part, "receiving data associated with a first network service provider; routing the data to a destination on the communication network using the one or more data processors in the first logical node; receiving data associated with a second network service provider; and routing

Appl. No. 10/665,809
Amdt. dated December 7, 2007
Reply to Office Action of June 21, 2007

PATENT

the data to a destination on the communication network using the one or more data processors in the second logical node." Applicants submit that Smith does not disclose a method for routing packet data as claimed.

3.   Claims 2-3, 5; 7-8; 15-16

Claims 2-3 and 5 depend from claim 1; claims 7-8 depend from claim 6; and claims 15-16 depend from claim 12. Each dependent claim incorporates all of the limitations of its respective base claim and each is therefore believed allowable over the cited reference for at least the reasons discussed above.

Rejections under Section 103

Claims 4, 9-10 and 13-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. as being unpatentable over Smith in view of Van Doren. Applicants submit that Van Doren fails to cure Smith's deficiencies as previously discussed. Thus, taken alone or in combination, the cited references fail to disclose each and every claimed element.

In addition, Applicants respectfully submit that a person of skill in the art would not be motivated to combine references, and that there would be no reasonable expectation of success through such a combination. Neither reference discloses a telecommunications device having control processors and data processors for routing data packets over a communication network. Also, neither reference describes logical nodes that are used in connection with routing packet data for a specific network service provider.

Applicants therefore respectfully submit that Smith in view of Van Doren fails to teach or suggest all elements of the rejected claims and that these references do not supply a proper motivation to combine and/or a reasonable expectation of success through their combination. Accordingly, reconsideration and allowance of claims 4, 9-10, and 13-14 is respectfully requested.

Appl. No. 10/665,809
Amdt. dated December 7, 2007
Reply to Office Action of June 21, 2007

PATENT

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance. The issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance at an early date is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 650-326-2400.

Respectfully submitted,

/H/L

Steven Raney
Reg. No. 58,317

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-3834
Tel: 650-326-2400   Fax: 415-576-0300
SAR:djb
61093925 v1